

Filed on behalf of Satco Products, Inc.

By: Robert S. Rigg (Reg. No. 36,991)
John K. Burke (Reg. No. 70,606)
Sudip K. Mitra (Reg. No. 75,900)
VEDDER PRICE P.C.
222 N. LaSalle St., Suite 2600
Chicago, Illinois 60601
Tel: (312) 609-7500
rrigg@vedderprice.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SATCO PRODUCTS, INC.
Petitioner
v.
LIGHTING SCIENCE GROUP CORPORATION
Patent Owner

Case IPR2017-01639
Patent 8,967,844 B2

**PETITIONER'S REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE TO
PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,967,844**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT.....	2
III. DR. BRETSCHNEIDER’S OPINIONS SHOULD NOT BE AFFORDED ANY WEIGHT BECAUSE OF HIS PRIOR RELATIONSHIP WITH LIGHTING SCIENCE GROUP CORPORATION.....	3
IV. CHOU IN LIGHT OF WEGNER RENDERS CLAIMS 1–3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16 AND 21–24 OBVIOUS	4
A. PATENT OWNER’S ARGUMENT ON ANTICIPATION ARE MISPLACED AS PETITIONER CHALLENGED THE CLAIMS UNDER OBVIOUSNESS AND NOT ANTICIPATION.....	4
B. CHOU IN LIGHT OF WEGNER RENDERS THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OBVIOUS.....	5
C. CHOU DISCLOSES AN H/D RATIO THAT IS EQUAL OR LESS THAN 0.25 AND RENDERS CLAIMS 3 AND 5 OBVIOUS	8
1. THERE IS NO DISPUTE AS TO THE PARAMETERS OF THE H/D RATIO AND WHAT IS INCLUDED IN THAT RATIO BASED ON THE CLAIMS AND THE SPECIFICATION OF THE ’844 PATENT.....	8
2. THE ’844 PATENT DOES NOT REQUIRE INCLUDING THE HEIGHT OF SECONDARY HEAT SINK 14 OF CHOU TO CALCULATE THE OVERALL HEIGHT (H) FOR THE H/D LIMITATION OF THE ’844 PATENT.....	10
D. CHOU AND WEGNER RENDER CLAIM 12 OBVIOUS	13
E. CHOU RENDERS CLAIM 21 OBVIOUS	14

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
F. CHOU RENDERS CLAIM 23 OBVIOUS	15
G. CHOU RENDERS CLAIM 24 OBVIOUS	16
V. CHOU IN LIGHT OF WEGNER AND ZHANG RENDERS CLAIM 10 OBVIOUS	16
VI. CLAIMS 1, 2, 9, 10, 16, 21 AND 22 ARE RENDERED OBVIOUS BY ZHANG.....	17
A. PATENT OWNER’S ARGUMENT ON ANTICIPATION ARE MISPLACED AS PETITIONER CHALLENGED THE CLAIMS UNDER OBVIOUSNESS AND NOT ANTICIPATION.....	18
B. ZHANG RENDERS THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS OBVIOUS	18
VII. ZHANG IN LIGHT OF WEGNER RENDERS CLAIM 17 OBVIOUS	21
VIII. ZHANG IN LIGHT OF SODERMAN RENDERS CLAIM 20 OBVIOUS	22
IX. THE ABSENCE OF SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS ALSO SUPPORTS OBVIOUSNESS	23
X. CONCLUSION	24

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Description
Ex. 1001	U.S. Patent No. 8,967,844
Ex. 1002	Declaration of Victor Roberts in Support of Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,967,844 (“Roberts Decl.”)
Ex. 1003	Preliminary Amendment
Ex. 1004	Office Action (FAOM)
Ex. 1005	Reply to Office Action (FAOM)
Ex. 1006	Notice of Allowance
Ex. 1007	Petition to Withdraw
Ex. 1008	Office Action
Ex. 1009	Reply to Office Action
Ex. 1010	Notice of Allowance
Ex. 1011	U.S. Patent No. 7,670,021 (“Chou”)
Ex. 1012	U.S. Patent No. 7,980,736 (“Soderman”)
Ex. 1013	U.S. Patent No. 7,722,227 (“Zhang”)
Ex. 1014	U.S. Patent No. 7,993,034 (“Wegner”)
Ex. 1015	U.S. Patent Pub No. 2009/0086476 (“Tickner”)
Ex. 1016	U.S. Patent No. 8,777,449 (“Van De Ven”)
Ex. 1017	OptoElctronix ULE5000 Series Data Sheet
Ex. 1018	Declaration of Dr. Victor Roberts in Support of Petitioner’s Reply to the Patent Owner’s Response to Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review Of U.S. Patent No. 8,967,844 (“Roberts Rebuttal Decl.”)

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>ABT Sys., LLC v. Emerson Elec. Co.</i> , 797 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	12
<i>Abtox, Inc. v. Exitron Corp.</i> , 122 F.3d 1019, 43 USPQ2d 1545 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	14
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , 752 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	23
<i>Cheese Sys. v. Tetra Pak Cheese & Powder Sys.</i> , 725 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	24
<i>Crystal Semiconductor Corp. v. TriTech Microelectronics Intern., Inc.</i> , 246 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2001)	14
<i>In re Cyclobenzaprine Hydrochloride Extended-Release Capsule Patent Litig.</i> , 676 F.3d 1063 (Fed. Cir. 2012)	23
<i>Elkay Mfg. Co. v. Ebco Mfg. Co.</i> , 192 F.3d 973, 52 USPQ2d 1109 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	14
<i>Ethicon, Inc. v. U.S. Surgical Corp.</i> , 135 F.3d 1456 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	3
<i>In re ICON Health and Fitness, Inc.</i> , 496 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	7, 19
<i>KCJ Corp. v. Kinetic Concepts, Inc.</i> , 223 F.3d 1351, 55 USPQ 2d 1835 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	14
<i>KSR Intern. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>SAS Inst., Inc. v. Iancu</i> , 2018 WL 1914661 (U.S. Apr. 24, 2018)	1

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.